UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,204	01/08/2007	Bruno Gaus	4266-0120PUS1	8817
	7590 10/25/201 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747	CH 374 22040 0747	VANDEUSEN, CHRISTOPHER		
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1774		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/25/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/576,204	GAUS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ait Ollic	

	Christopher K. VanDeusen	1774	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 October 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 tension and the corresponding amount of the chortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date.	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII 36(a) and the appropriate of the fee. The appropriate analy set in the final Office	e extension fee ate extension; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of appeal. Since a
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a considered after a final rejection, but a considered after a considered and a considered after a considered after a considered and a considered after a considered after a considered and a considered and a considered after a considered and a considered a considered and a considered and a considered and a considered a considered and a considered and a considered and a considered a considered and a considered a considered and a considered a considered a considered a considered a considered a considered and a considered a co	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); ter form for appeal by materially rec corresponding number of finally reje	E below); ducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.14. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor		,
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 3-6. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 7-10. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		-	-
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the property of t	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Walter D. Griffin/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1774			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: a. the proposed amendment recites additional components and specifies a new arrangement of the components in the method of claim 1. Such amendments would require further search and consideration by the examiner, and as a matter of practice such amendments are not entered after a Final Rejection.

c. the proposed amendment recites additional components, which would complicate the appeals process if entered..

Continuation of 13. Other: Regarding applicant's argument that Erickson '558 does not properly address the claimed limitations as it is used in a non-analogous art, Erickson '558 is directed to solving the problem of preventing backflow in a fluid-flow system (see citations in Final Rejection, 07/19/2010). As such, Erickson '558 is directed to an analogous art.

The applicant further argues that Erickson '558 teaches a different method than the one claimed. The examiner agrees with this assertion; however, the Erickson '558 reference taken in combination with the Berendsen reference as cited in the Final Rejection addresses the claimed limitations as cited. As such, this rejection is appropriate as previously cited.